



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,493	02/12/2004	Ashvin Joseph Mathew	MS#304548.01 (5096)	5231
38779 7590 11/04/2008 SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT) 100 NORTH BROADWAY 17TH FLOOR ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			EXAMINER BLACK, LINH	
			ART UNIT 2169	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-17, 19-24, 27-28, 30-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 23-24, 28 are the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-17, 19-24, 27-28, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Traversat et al. (2002/0147810).

As per claim 1, Traversat et al. teach

a method of providing access to a resource for one or more users - paragraphs 71, 73, and 77.

receiving an authorization request from a first entity to issue authorization data for the one or more users based on roles associated with the users - pars. 162, 368, and 440.

Art Unit: 2169

authorization data is required by a second entity for allowing the first entity to access a resource controlled by the second entity – pars. 78 (facilities provided as services in the service layer may include...authentication...peer group membership), 102 (each peer group may have different policies to authorize a peer to become a rendezvous peer), 328, 439.

responsive to the received authorization request, issuing the authorization data to the first entity – pars. 439-440.

wherein the first entity provides the issued authorization data to the second entity, said authorization data including an expression identifying the resource by a resource name and by at least one property associated with the resource to conditionally define access to the resource – pars. 72, 159, 331, 422-426.

said authorization data further including validation information; receiving a validation request from the second entity to validate the issued authorization data that was provided to the second entity by the first entity...included therein – pars. 162, 422-423, 439, 455.

As per claim 4, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the request and issuing the authorization data occur over a secure sockets layer – pars. 418-419, 437.

Art Unit: 2169

As per claim 5, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the request and issuing the authorization data occur over a network such as the Internet – pars. 77-78.

As per claim 6, Traversat et al. teach

creating the expression identifying the resource in authorization data in response to the received authorization request – pars. 30, 325, 364.

As per claim 7, Traversat et al. teach

encrypting the created expression – pars. 78, 94, 139.

As per claims 11 and 23, Traversat et al. teach

a method for validating authorization data to provide access to a resource for one or more users - pars. 71, 73, 77.

receiving an authorization request from a client to issue authorization data for the one or more users based on roles associated with the users – pars. 162, 368, and 440.

wherein said authorization data is required by an affiliate server for allowing the client to access a resource controlled by said affiliate/second/member/partner server - pars. 78

Art Unit: 2169

(facilities provided as services in the service layer may include...authentication...peer group membership), 102 (each peer group may have different policies to authorize a peer to become a rendezvous peer), 328, 439.

responsive to the received authorization request, generating an authorization token – pars. 139, 439.

having a header field (pars. 132, 144, 355), a source field, and a claim field, said header field representing validation information, said source field representing the identity of the user (pars. 242-246), said claim field specifying the resource conditionally, said claim field including an expression identifying the resource by a resource name (pars. 113, 117, 159, 172)and by at least one property associated with the resource to conditionally define access to the resource – pars. 72, 107, 139, 162.

sending the authorization token to the client, wherein the client provides the authorization token to the affiliate server – pars. 139, 439.

receiving a validation request from the affiliate server to validate the authorization token, wherein said validation request includes the authorization token – pars. 72, 355, 422-425.

retrieving validation information from the header of the received authorization data; evaluating the retrieved validation information to determine a validation status of the received authorization token – pars. 162, 206, 439-440.

Art Unit: 2169

sending a response to the affiliate server indicating the determined validation status responsive to said evaluating the retrieved validation information – pars. 325, 352, 355.

As per claim 12, Traversat et al. teach

evaluating the expression to identify the resource – par. 72.

As per claim 13, Traversat et al. teach

extracting a target scope from the received authorization data, said extracted target scope identifying the resource – pars. 71, 110-112.

As per claim 14, Traversat et al. teach

receiving a data packet according to the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), and further comprising extracting the authorization data from the received data packet – pars. 243, 425, 431-439.

As per claim 15, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the validation request including the authorization token occurs over a secure sockets layer – pars. 418-419, 437.

As per claim 16, Traversat et al. teach

wherein receiving the validation request including the authorization token occurs over a network such as the Internet – pars. 77-78.

As per claim 17, Traversat et al. teach

decrypting the received authorization data token – pars. 139, 441.

As per claim 19, Traversat et al. teach

retrieving a signature from the header of the received authorization data – pars. 94, 139, 143.

As per claim 20, Traversat et al. teach

determining that the retrieved signature is invalid, and wherein sending the response comprises sending a response indicating the invalidity of the received authorization data token – pars. 139, 426, claim 12.

As per claim 21, Traversat et al. teach

Art Unit: 2169

wherein retrieving the validation information comprises retrieving an expiration date from the header of the received authorization token – pars. 451-453.

and wherein evaluating the retrieved validation information comprises comparing the retrieved expiration date to a current time stamp to determine if the received authorization token has expired – pars. 439-440.

As per claim 22, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the received authorization token has been determined to be expired, and further comprising sending a response indicating the invalidity of the received authorization token – pars. 152, 451, 453.

As per claim 24, Traversat et al. teach

receive an authorization request from a first entity to issue authorization data for the one or more users based on roles associated with the users - pars. 162, 368, and 440.

wherein said authorization data is required by a second entity for allowing the client to access a resource controlled by said second entity - pars. 72-74, 78.

an authorization component adapted to issue the requested authorization data for the users based on the roles associated with the users – pars. 162, 368, and 440.

Art Unit: 2169

an expression identifying a resource by a resource name and by a property associated with the resource and said authorization data including the validation information – pars. 72, 159, 331, 422-426.

receive a validation request from the second entity, said validation request including the authorization data – pars. 162, 175, 439.

a parser component adapted to retrieve validation information from the received authorization data – pars. 30, 121, 219.

a validation component adapted to evaluate the retrieved validation information – pars. 162, 439.

wherein the interface component is further adapted to send a response indicating the validation status of the received authorization data responsive to said evaluating the retrieved validation information – pars. 81, 101, 323-325.

As per claim 27, Traversat et al. teach

a scope component to evaluate the expression to identify the resource – par. 72.

As per claim 28, Traversat et al. teach

a memory area for storing authorization data for use in providing a first entity access to a resource that is controlled by a second entity – pars. 72, 77-78, 139.

Art Unit: 2169

said authorization data including an expression identifying the resource by a resource name and by at least one property associated with the resource – pars. 72, 159, 331, 422-426.issuing responsive to a request from the first entity, the au

thorization data for a user based on a role associated with the user and for validating, in response to a request from the second entity, the authorization data to provide access to the resource – pars. 162, 175, 439.

As per claim 30, Traversat et al. teach

evaluating the expression to identify the resource – par. 72.

As per claim 31, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the authorization data comprises a token – pars. 139, 439.

As per claim 36, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the first entity is an application program - pars. 124, 362, 458.

As per claim 37, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the first entity is a computing device – pars. 88-89, 97, 328.

As per claim 38, Traversat et al. teach

generating a signature based on the expression identifying the resource, and wherein the validation information includes said generated signature – pars. 94, 139, 451-453.

As per claim 39, Traversat et al. teach

wherein the validation information includes an expiration date – pars. 451-453.

As per claim 40, Traversat et al. teach

a site identifier identifying the first entity - pars. 72, 88-89, 97, 328.

As per claim 41, Traversat et al. teach

retrieving the validation information from the received authorization data – pars. 72, 101, 121, 422-423, 441.

evaluating the retrieved validation information - pars. 162, 439.

sending a response to the second entity indicating the validation status of the received authorization data responsive to said evaluating the retrieved validation information – pars. 325, 352, 355.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/7/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant had amended independent claims, thus, new cited columns and lines are provided above. Examiner disagrees that Traversat fails to disclose authorizing access to specific resources associated with a role assigned to the peer. Please see pars. 77, 234, 440.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., provide a central management for resources...) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH BLACK whose telephone number is 571-272-4106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trujillo can be reached on 571-272-3677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2169

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LINH BLACK
Examiner
Art Unit 2169

October 26, 2008

/HUNG Q. PHAM/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169